



Housing Management and Almshouses Sub (Community and Children's Services) Committee

Date: MONDAY, 22 MARCH 2021
Time: 11.00 am
Venue: VIRTUAL MEETING – ACCESSIBLE REMOTELY

Members: John Fletcher (Chairman)
Mary Durcan (Deputy Chairman)
Randall Anderson
Marianne Fredericks
Alderman David Graves
Dhruv Patel
Susan Pearson
William Pimlott
Peter Bennett
The Revd Stephen Haines
Ruby Sayed

Enquiries: Julie.Mayer@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Accessing the virtual public meeting:

Members of the public can observe this virtual public meeting at link below:

<https://youtu.be/1W0UIBx-AYA>

This meeting will be a virtual meeting and therefore will not take place in a physical location following regulations made under Section 78 of the Coronavirus Act 2020. A recording of the public meeting will be available via the above link following the end of the public meeting for up to one municipal year. Please note: Online meeting recordings do not constitute the formal minutes of the meeting; minutes are written and are available on the City of London Corporation's website. Recordings may be edited, at the discretion of the proper officer, to remove any inappropriate material.

John Barradell
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

Part 1 - Public Reports

1. **APOLOGIES**
2. **MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**
3. **MINUTES**
To approve the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 12th January 2021.

For Decision
(Pages 1 - 6)
4. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**
The Sub Committee is asked to note the Outstanding Actions List.

For Information
(Pages 7 - 8)
5. **DEBT RECOVERY POLICY**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.

For Decision
(Pages 9 - 18)
6. **INCOME RECOVERY POLICY**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.

For Decision
(Pages 19 - 28)
7. **SAFEGUARDING POLICY REVIEW**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.

For Decision
(Pages 29 - 42)
8. **CONCRETE TESTING & REPAIRS TO GOLDEN LANE AND MIDDLESEX STREET ESTATES - GATEWAY 6 - OUTCOME REPORT**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.

For Decision
(Pages 43 - 54)
9. **DECENT HOMES WORKS TO PROPERTIES PREVIOUSLY OMITTED FROM PROGRAMMES (CALL-BACKS 2017-2020): GATEWAY 6 - OUTCOME REPORT**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.

For Decision
(Pages 55 - 62)
10. **HOUSING MAJOR WORKS PROGRAMME - PROGRESS REPORT**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.

For Information
(Pages 63 - 72)

11. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE**
12. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
13. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**
MOTION - That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

Part 2 - Non-Public Reports

14. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**
To approve the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 12th January 2021.
For Decision
(Pages 73 - 76)
15. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE**
16. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

Confidential

17. **REVIEW OF INVOLVEMENT AND ENGAGEMENT FUNCTIONS**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
For Decision

This page is intentionally left blank

**HOUSING MANAGEMENT AND ALMSHOUSES SUB (COMMUNITY AND
CHILDREN'S SERVICES) COMMITTEE**
Tuesday, 12 January 2021

Minutes of the meeting of the Housing Management and Almshouses Sub
(Community and Children's Services) Committee held at VIRTUAL MEETING –
ACCESSIBLE REMOTELY on Tuesday, 12 January 2021 at 1.00 pm

Present

Members:

Mary Durcan (Deputy Chairman)
Randall Anderson
Marianne Fredericks
Alderman David Graves
Susan Pearson
William Pimlott
Peter Bennett
The Revd Stephen Haines
Ruby Sayed

Officers:

Rofikul Islam	- Town Clerk's Department
Gemma Stokley	- Town Clerk's Department
James Gibson	- Chamberlains Department
Aqib Hussain	- Chamberlains Department
Liam Gillespie	- Community and Children's Services
Paul Murtagh	- Community and Children's Services
Mike Saunders	- Community and Children's Services
Steve Spooner	- Community and Children's Services
Jacqueline Whitmore	- Community and Children's Services

In attendance:

Martin Wright - Wates Construction

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from John Fletcher (Chairman) and Jason Pritchard.

**2. MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN
RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

There was none.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED - That the public minutes of the meeting held virtually on meeting
on 30 November 2020 be approved as a correct record.

Matters arising

The Chair noted that there are several references to reports being referred to as to be presented to the Committee at a later date, and the Chair asked that for the future, such references should include a date for when the reports will be presented.

4. OUTSTANDING ACTIONS

The Assistant Director, Barbican Estate & Property Services, went through the list and updated the Committee on the action tracker. The Committee agreed to remove the following items from the action tracker, as they have now been completed;

- Tenancy Visits
- Fire Safety
- Housing Policies – Renewal Timetable
- Pets Policy – HRA
- Presentation from Wates Construction
- Estate Inspections Performance

5. PETS POLICY REVIEW

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services on the Pets Policy Review.

A Member noted that the result of the consultation was very diverse with varied opinions. The Member asked if the policy will be applied across all the Estates or if this will be driven by the demands of each Estates. The Head of Housing Management responded that the policy would be applied across the board; the policy was based on the terms of the City Corporation's standard Secure Tenancy Agreement.

Another Member asked that the policy refers to residents having to seek permission, where can the applicants obtain the forms from. The Head of Housing Management responded that small pets such as cats do not require approval, but dogs will require prior written permission. The information on this is provided on the City of London's website and will be advertised in the resident magazine too, which is published twice a year. The Committee was also informed that Members are still welcome to comment on the policy's wording if they think any part is unclear, as this remains a draft document.

Another Member asked if the policy would have room for exemptions such as therapy dogs, which some people may use in a therapeutic way, such as assisting with mental health. The Members were assured by the Head of Housing Management that there is a provision in place to make exceptions on a case by case basis, for example, if the resident can provide supporting documents from their Doctors or a specialist agency. The approval for such exemptions can be granted by an Estate Manager and is not a lengthy process.

It was suggested that for future consultations, officers should look at consequences for owners of unruly dogs and how they might manage dogs' ownership if it were to be allowed.

RESOLVED – That the Committee;

- Approved the reviewed Pets Policy for use by the Housing Division; and
- Members indicated that more detailed consultation is considered necessary when the policy is next reviewed.

6. HOUSING ESTATE PARKING MANAGEMENT REVIEW - PROGRESS UPDATE

The Committee received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services on the Housing Estate Parking Management Review - Progress Update.

The Committee was informed that the review of this policy came from the need to review the City of London's Parking charges and as part of the decision made by Members to increase concession for disabled drivers by 100%. A consultant was commissioned to explore this further, and the report sets out the findings.

A Member asked if the report could have provided a variation of the charges rather than just a summary. The Member further commented that on the Golden Lane Estate, there is an ongoing piece of work with grants from CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) to invest in bike storage and, as such, Officers should ensure that this policy does not hinder the ongoing application, which is being sponsored by the Member.

This was followed by another Member who agreed that the report did not appear to consider all the options and, as such, other alternatives may need to be explored beyond the current scope of this report. Another Member commented that consideration should be given to converting unused parking spaces into open spaces for residents.

The Head of Housing Management commented that Members would have access to the full report once the final version is ready. In terms of alternative use of space, this was beyond the scope of this report. The Department may consider this option for the future and look at recreational spaces for the residents.

The Chair asked if the full report can be circulated with the Committee.

RESOLVED – That the Committee noted the report.

7. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE

Communication Strategy

A Member commented that out of the 550 flats on Golden Lane Estate, a recent communication was sent to just 150 homes as this is the number of email address Officers have access to. The email was the only method used to

communicate in this instance. Can officers develop an action plan to improve this coverage and ensure that all residents are kept up to date.

In light of the COVID-19, it is vital to ensure that the City of London can engage with all its residents, considering these viable options should be explored.

Assistant Director Barbican & Property Services replied that the Department is reviewing its own policy regarding its Communication Strategy. The Committee was informed that each of the e-mail addresses which the Departments hold are various purposes rather than for a generic issue. The Communication Strategy review will allow the Department to explore this further and allow a diverse use of communications with residents across the Estates.

Anti-Social Behaviour on Avondale Square Estate

A Member commented that there seems to be an increase in anti-social behavior within the Estate, with a recent trial patrol service decommissioned. The patrol had added value to Estate and increased the quality of life for the residents.

The Head of Housing Management responded that the Department is aware of the increase of the anti-social behavior. It introduced the patrol service on a trial basis in response to this issue. The pilot scheme was always due to end in late 2020. Steps are being taken to commission a new service to help address the issues on the Estate. This will involve consulting residents. Regrettably, the patrol ended without a replacement service in place, but residents were informed the trial service was time-limited.

Officers apologised for the way the end of the trial contract was communicated with the residents and have assured Members that this will be more clearly communicated in the future.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

There was no other business.

9. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED – That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

10. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES

RESOLVED - That the public minutes of the meeting held virtually on meeting on 30 November 2020 be approved as a correct record.

11.1 Wates Living Space

The Committee received a presentation on the Repairs Service from Officers and the Managing Director of Wates Living Space.

11.2 Post Presentation Discussion

The Committee discussed the information contained in the presentation on the Repairs Service.

11.3 Crescent House/ Cullum Welch House Heating Replacement

The Committee received the report of the Director of Community and Children's Services on the Crescent House/ Cullum Welch House Heating Replacement Project.

12. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE

There were no non-public questions.

13. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED

There was no other business.

The meeting ended at 3.04 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Rofikul Islam
Rofikul.islam@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

**Housing Management and Almshouses Sub Committee (HMASC)
Action Tracker**

Date Added	Subject	Action Agreed	Responsible Officer	Target Meeting Date - HMASC	Update
16/09/19	New Portsoken Community Centre	A report to HMASC setting out recommendations for governance.	Carol Boswarthack / Simon Cribbens	March/May 2020	
20/11/19	Fire Safety	Update on progress with sprinklers and other fire safety measures.	Paul Murtagh	November 2020	Included in agenda for 30 November meeting.
20/11/19	Member Estate Visits	Members to visit North and South Estates preferably before or after HMASC meeting.	Liam Gillespie / Town Clerk	As soon as possible after May 2021	Following election of new HMASC Members.
20/11/19	Great Arthur House – Cladding Works	Members to receive report on next stages in legal process including, legal costs to date and potential future costs.	City Surveyor / Comptroller / Paul Murtagh	As soon as possible after Court of Appeal hearing	Court of Appeal Hearing expected in January 2021 but, likely delayed due to Covid-19.
30/09/20	Personal Emergency Evacuation Plan (PEEP)	Members to receive a report on PEEPS for our residents.	Paul Murtagh / Liam Gillespie	May 2021	
30/09/20	Climate Action Strategy - Funding	Members to receive a report on the implications of the Corporation's Climate Action Strategy including available funding and projects.	City Surveyor / Paul Murtagh	May 2021	Corporation has published its Climate Action Strategy. Officers working with City Surveyor on implications for Housing.
30/11/20	Report of Climate Action Strategy - Funding	Following the discussions with the various Chairs, to agree a way forward in terms of reporting to the Committee.	Paul Murtagh	January 2021	
30/11/20	Review Period of Policies	Once all the actions so far have been completed, for the Committee to explore the review period for the policies.	Liam Gillespie	May 2021	

Housing Management and Almshouses Sub Committee (HMASC)
Action Tracker

Committee:	Dated:
Housing Management and Almshouses Sub-Committee	22/03/2021
Subject: Debt Recovery Policy	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	4
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	N
If so, how much?	£
What is the source of Funding?	
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	Y/N
Report of: Director of Community and Children's Services	For Decision
Report author: Liam Gillespie, Head of Housing Management	

Summary

The Housing Service must pursue debts from former residents and users of its facilities in order to maximise income to the Housing Revenue Account. These debts are typically rent arrears or rechargeable costs left unpaid at the end of a tenancy but also include other debts owed to the Housing Service, such as unpaid charges for parking or storage sheds.

The approach to former resident debts has been outlined in the new Debt Recovery Policy, which has been drafted as part of the project to refresh our housing management policies.

The new policy also addresses our approach to writing off debts which are deemed irrecoverable.

Recommendation

Members are asked to:

- Approve the Debt Recovery Policy for use by the Housing Service

Main Report

Background

1. The Housing Service has responsibility for pursuing debts from former residents and service users. A new Debt Recovery Policy has been written to cover our work in this area. The policy is based on established practice and covers

situations where a debt is owed to us following the end of a tenancy, lease or licence, or under some other agreement.

2. Debts owed by current residents and service users, for example rent or service charge arrears, are subject to a different regime and are covered by the separate Income Recovery Policy.
3. The type of debts covered by the Debt Recovery Policy include:
 - Former tenant rent or service charge arrears (e.g. after eviction or tenancy surrender)
 - Rechargeable repair costs following the end of a tenancy
 - Property clearance costs following the end of a tenancy
 - Unpaid parking or storage shed payments following the termination of a licence
 - Unpaid hall hire charges where no ongoing agreement exists

Current Position

4. The approach taken involves attempting to trace the debtor using their last known contact details and requiring payment. If we can contact the debtor, we will agree repayment terms depending on the size of the debt and their circumstances.
5. If a debtor cannot be contacted, credit checks may be carried out to attempt to trace them. Debts may also be referred to a collection agent who will attempt to trace the debtor and establish their ability to repay the outstanding amount.
6. Debts which are deemed irrecoverable, due to us not being able to trace the debtor, or the amount involved making such efforts uneconomical, will be written off in accordance with the City Corporation's financial regulations. The regulations require certain write-offs to be approved by Committee and this process is also subject to periodic internal and external auditing.

Conclusion

7. A Debt Recovery Policy has been drafted to outline our approach to recovering debts owed to the Housing Service by former residents and service users. The policy is based on established practice in this area and is intended to support officers in maximising income to the Housing Revenue Account.
8. The policy also outlines how debt write-offs will be dealt with, should debts be deemed irrecoverable.

Appendices

- **Appendix 1: Debt Recovery Policy**

Liam Gillespie

Head of Housing Management
Department of Community and Children's Services

E: liam.gillespie@cityoflondon.gov.uk

T: 020 7332 3785

This page is intentionally left blank



City of London Corporation
Department of Community & Children's Services
Housing Service

Debt Recovery Policy

Approved by:	<i>Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee</i>
Approval Date:	
Next Review Date:	
Version:	<i>Version 1.0</i>

1. **Purpose & Scope**

We have this policy because we want former residents and service users to know our approach to the collection of any debts or amounts due which are unpaid when they move out of one of our properties, or no longer receive services from us.

This policy applies to:

- Former residents of the City Corporation's Housing Service (all tenures)
- Former service users of the City of London Housing Service

The policy covers all debts owed to us by former residents, including rent arrears, service charge arrears, rechargeable costs (including court costs) and other sundry debts.

“Service users” refers to anyone who has received a service from us and left an unpaid debt (for example charges for parking, storage facilities or hall hire).

This policy applies to properties or services managed as part of the Housing Revenue account, including former residents of the City of London and Gresham Almshouses.

Debts incurred by current residents, such as rent arrears, are dealt with by the *Income Recovery Policy*.

2. **Policy aims and objectives**

Our aim is to ensure the minimum level of former resident debt and reduce the amounts written off. We will do this by developing a consistent, co-ordinated and effective approach to debt recovery.

3. **Service standards**

When we deal with the recovery of former resident debt we will:

- Adopt a firm but fair approach.
- Provide information about all debts due to us as soon as we are advised by a resident or service user that they intend to end their tenancy, lease or other service
- Offer a wide range of payment options to make it as easy as possible for debtors to pay off their debt
- Allow payment by instalments where reasonable

4. Legislation and regulatory obligations

4.1 When recovering former resident debt, we will have regard to the following regulatory requirements:

- Manage our resources effectively to ensure our viability is maintained
- Ensure that optimal benefit is derived from our resources and assets

4.2 There are no specific legislative requirements. We will ensure that any debt recovery agents that we employ comply with their industry codes of practice and are members of a relevant regulatory body.

5. Our approach to former resident/service user debts

5.1 General principles

We will work with residents and service users to ensure that debts are repaid before they cease to be residents or service users. In all cases, residents/service users will be asked to provide a forwarding address. Our approach will be firm but fair when former residents or service users owe us money. We will always act in a sensitive manner appropriate to the debtor's individual circumstances. Where efforts to contact debtors fail, we may use the services of a specialist agency to trace them.

5.2 Vulnerable debtors

Any action to recover debts will take account of the debtor's personal circumstances. We may not pursue recovery of debts where exceptional circumstances exist, and recovery of the debt would cause unreasonable hardship to the debtor.

5.3 Enforcement

We will provide debtors with an opportunity to agree a repayment plan. However, if a debt persists or debtor is unwilling to make an agreement, we may take legal action or employ the services of a debt recovery agent to recover the debt on our behalf.

5.4 Writing off debts

We recognise the need to balance the cost of recovering debts against the amount owed. We will pursue all former resident or service user debts unless it is not possible to locate the debtor, the debtor is able to demonstrate an inability to repay the amount due, or it is not deemed cost effective to pursue the debt. Former resident or service user debts that are deemed irrecoverable will be written off promptly in accordance with our financial regulations.

6. Responsibility, monitoring and performance

- 6.1 Overall responsibility for this policy and its implementation rests with the Head of Housing Management. The Head of Housing Management will ensure that staff receive the appropriate training and support to achieve the aims of this policy. Where needed we may establish appropriate operational procedures.
- 6.2 Monitoring of the implementation of this policy and our performance in recovering former resident or service user debts will be the responsibility of the Housing Management and Almshouses Sub-Committee.

7. Associated policies

- Income Recovery Policy
- Lettings and Transfers Policy

8. Document Management

Policy title	Former Resident or service user Debt Recovery Policy
Date created	February 2021
Policy owner	Head of Housing Management
Authorised by	Housing Management and Almshouses Sub-Committee
Date authorised	
Review period	3 years
Date of next review	

Consultation and assessment

Resident or service user consultation	Housing User Board (Feb. 2021)
Equality Analysis	Not required. This policy will ensure consistency and fairness in the collection of former resident or service users debts.
Data Protection Impact Assessment	Not required. Minimal risk of data breaches. Data Sharing Agreement in place with collection agencies.

Document review history			
Version	Date amended	Date approved	Key changes
1.0	N/A		Original document. New policy that focusses on our approach to the recovery of debts from former resident or service users.

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee:	Dated:
Housing Management and Almshouses Sub-Committee	22/03/2021
Subject: Income Recovery Policy	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	4
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	N
If so, how much?	£
What is the source of Funding?	
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	Y/N
Report of: Director of Community and Children's Services	For Decision
Report author: Liam Gillespie, Head of Housing Management	

Summary

An Income Recovery Policy has been drafted as part of the project to refresh our housing management policies. This new policy governs our approach to collecting rent, service charges and other money due to the Housing Service from residents and other service users.

The Policy reflects established practice and aims to strike an appropriate balance between prioritising income collection and providing support to people who may be struggling to pay rent or other charges.

Recommendation

Members are asked to:

- Approve the Income Recovery Policy for use by the Housing Service

Main Report

Background

1. The Housing Service manages over 2,900 homes, as well as over 1,000 parking and storage facilities on its housing estates. The collection of rents, service charges and other fees is carried out by staff across the Housing Division in accordance with established procedures.

2. As part of the project to review our housing management policies, a new Income Recovery Policy has been introduced to outline our approach to dealing with rent and service charge arrears, plus other debts incurred by current residents and service users.
3. A separate policy has been drafted to cover former residents and service users whose tenancies, leases or licenses have ended, leaving a debt owing to the City Corporation.

Current Position

4. Receipts from rents, service charges and parking or storage facilities are the main sources of income to the Housing Revenue Account and it is therefore vital that officers properly manage these accounts. The Housing Service invests significant resources in effectively managing its rent and service charge accounts, and in assisting residents when their accounts go into arrears.
5. The regular payment of rent and service charges are important conditions of our tenancies and leases and arrears can result in possession proceedings or other enforcement action being taken against residents, which could ultimately result in them losing their homes.
6. The Housing Service aims to make it as easy as possible for residents to maintain their rent and service charge accounts and to provide support and advice to those who find themselves struggling to pay due to financial hardship.
7. Specialist officers deal with rent arrears for our tenanted properties, as this work is time intensive and can be legally complex. Other arrears, such as those for parking or storage facilities, are dealt with by the Rents Team and by local estate teams.
8. The Income Recovery Policy outlines our approach to arrears management generally. We will:
 - take a preventative approach to arrears by making residents aware of their obligations, for example at the commencement of the tenancy or lease
 - keep residents up to date on their accounts by issuing regular account statements
 - intervene early to help when accounts fall into arrears
 - offer appropriate advice and support to those facing financial hardship
 - be mindful of individual circumstances when discussing arrears and repayment options
 - operate a staged recovery process for arrears recovery
9. This approach has proved effective and Members may wish to note that the Housing Service has a high rate of success in reducing arrears without taking formal legal action. When legal action is taken, we must demonstrate that other measures have been attempted first. Possession proceedings are a last resort and the courts will only award possession if it is reasonable to do so.

10. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on our residents has resulted in an increase in arrears, which officers are managing by maintaining contact with affected residents and ensuring they have access to appropriate help, including welfare benefits advice and help with making claims.

Conclusion

11. An Income Recovery Policy has been drafted as part of the project to refresh our housing management policies. This new policy governs our approach to collecting rent, service charges and other money due to the Housing Service from residents and other service users.
12. The new policy is based on established procedures for arrears collection, which aim to balance supportive and preventative work with a responsive approach to arrears collection.

Appendices:

- Appendix 1: Draft Income Recovery Policy (v.1)

Liam Gillespie

Head of Housing Management
Department of Community and Children's Services

E: liam.gillespie@cityoflondon.gov.uk
T: 020 7332 3785

This page is intentionally left blank



City of London Corporation
Department of Community & Children's Services
Housing Service

Income Recovery Policy

Approved by:	<i>Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee</i>
Approval Date:	
Version	<i>1.0</i>
Next Review Date:	<i>+3 years</i>

1. Purpose and scope

- 1.1 We have this policy because we want our residents and service users to know our approach to the recovery of rent and service charge arrears, or other charges due to the City of London's Housing Service. It sets out what we will do to prevent arrears and other debts and the action we will take when rent or other charges are not paid.
- 1.2 This policy includes our approach to any debts arising from a breach of a current tenancy, lease or licence. It applies to all homes managed by the City Corporation's Housing Division, including the City of London and Gresham Almshouses. It also applies to any non-residents who are required to pay a charge to us for a service we provide, for example parking, storage or hall hire.

2. Policy aims and objectives

- 2.1 Our aim is to minimise any loss of income from missed or unpaid rent or other charges. By doing this we will help our residents and secure the income we need to provide services and invest in our homes.
- 2.2 We expect all residents and service users to pay their rent and other charges. However, we recognise that for a variety of reasons, individuals encounter financial hardship and as a social landlord we are committed to providing appropriate support when this is needed.

3. Service standards

- 3.1 We will provide a high-quality income recovery service that will:

- Provide residents and service users with a range of payment options
- Encourage and promote automatic payments
- Provide residents and service users with periodic statements of their accounts
- Assist residents in the completion of claims for benefits, offer advice and signpost to appropriate support agencies
- Develop links with local agencies that will assist residents with managing their debts
- Tell residents and service users promptly about any debts they may have and agree repayment

4.0 Legislation and regulation obligations

4.1 This policy will have regard to the following requirements of the Regulator of Social Housing:

- Tenancy Standard – We shall develop and provide services that will support tenants to maintain their tenancy and prevent unnecessary evictions.

4.2 The policy will ensure that we comply with current legislation, the Civil Procedure Rules, in particular the Pre-action Protocol for Possession Claims by Social Landlord, plus any interim court rules introduced in relation to residential possession proceedings.

5. Our approach to income recovery

5.1 General principles

We will promote a culture where residents or service users appreciate the importance of paying rent and other charges on time and their obligations under the terms of their tenancy, lease, or licence. We require rent and/or service charge accounts to be maintained in credit.

We will offer a variety of payment methods and encourage residents and service users to tell us before they get into difficulty with their payments. Our approach to debt recovery will be firm but supportive.

We will off-set any debt owed to us against any money that we may be required to pay to a resident or service user.

5.2 Early intervention

We will be proactive and use technology and customer intelligence to target early intervention. We will take prompt steps to avoid and minimise the build-up of arrears. We will contact residents and service users as soon as they go into arrears and attempt to identify potential problems at an early stage.

5.3 Information and support

We recognise that some residents and service users will need help and support to maintain their obligations. Assistance and information will be given on the range of benefits available using a variety of methods.

We will develop and maintain good links with the Department of Work and Pensions and other agencies in order to assist residents to resolve claims as quickly as possible.

We will signpost residents to our partners and other agencies so that they can access good quality debt and budgeting advice. We may run campaigns from time to time promoting the payment of rent and other charges, targeting those in arrears.

5.4 Vulnerable residents and service users

Any action to recover arrears will take account of a resident's or service user's individual needs and circumstances. We will attempt to assist residents in arrears, or experiencing financial hardship, to access any services able to help them sustain their tenancies, leases or licences.

We may use new technology and information gathered through the collection of resident profiles to target support and intervention where a resident may be at risk of falling into arrears.

5.5 Enforcement

We will operate a staged recovery process and attempt to reach agreements with individuals to repay arrears and other debts, which are both manageable for the resident or service user and acceptable to us.

If arrears persist or a resident or service user is unwilling to make an agreement, we may take legal action which could lead to eviction. Residents with arrears or subject to enforcement action will not normally be able to transfer to another City of London home, or obtain parking, garage or storage facilities.

6. Responsibilities, monitoring and performance

- 6.1 Overall responsibility for this policy and its implementation rests with the Head of Housing Management. The Head of Housing Management will ensure that staff receive the appropriate training and support to achieve the aims of this policy. Where needed we may establish appropriate operational procedures.
- 6.2 Monitoring of the implementation of this policy and our performance in recovering arrears and other charges will be the responsibility of the Housing Management and Almshouses Sub-Committee.

7. **Associated policies**

- Former Customer Debt Recovery Policy
- Rent Policy
- Shared Ownership and Leaseholder Policy
- Tenancy Policy
- Lettings and Transfer Policy
- Recharges Policy

8. **Document Management**

Policy title	Income Recovery Policy
Date created	
Policy owner	Head of Housing Management
Authorised by	Housing Management and Almhouses Sub-Committee
Date authorised	
Review period	3 years
Date of next review	

Consultation and assessment	
Customer consultation	
Equality Analysis	
Data Protection Impact Assessment	Not required. Minimal risk of data breaches. Use of personal data covered by Privacy Notice.

Document review history			
Version	Date amended	Date approved	Key changes
1.0			Original document

Committee:	Dated: 22/03/2021
Housing Management and Almshouses Sub-Committee	
Subject: Safeguarding Policy Review	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	1
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	N
If so, how much?	£
What is the source of Funding?	
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	N
Report of: Director of Community and Children's Services	For Decision
Report author: Liam Gillespie, Head of Housing Management, DCCS	

Summary

The Housing Division's Safeguarding Policy has been reviewed as part of a project to refresh our housing management policies and create several new ones. This policy was first approved in 2016 and it outlines the Housing Division's approach to safeguarding vulnerable adults and children.

The policy is supported by guidance for officers on safeguarding procedures. The Housing Division's training programme includes safeguarding training for staff of all grades at appropriate intervals.

Recommendation

Members are asked to:

- approve the reviewed Safeguarding Policy for use by the Housing Division

Main Report

Background

1. Local authorities have statutory safeguarding responsibilities in relation to adults at risk of abuse or neglect, and a duty to safeguard and promote the welfare of all children in their area. The legislation makes it clear that safeguarding is the responsibility of everyone, and that organisations and professionals must work in partnership when carrying out their duties.

2. The City Corporation's corporate safeguarding policy sets out its overall approach to safeguarding matters. Safeguarding strategy and practice is overseen by the City and Hackney Safeguarding Adults Board and the City and Hackney Safeguarding Children Board.
3. Effective safeguarding requires a multi-disciplinary approach and the duties of various professionals can differ significantly. The Housing Division therefore devised a Safeguarding Policy several years ago in order to explain its approach to safeguarding in a housing context. The policy was approved by this Committee in January 2016 and has now been refreshed as part of the ongoing review of all the City Corporation's housing management policies.

Current Position

4. The policy is supported by guidance for housing officers, which is also being refreshed. This guidance will be reinforced by training for officers of all grades, which will be scheduled as part of the annual training plan for the Housing Division.
5. In addition, more senior staff have been designated as safeguarding leads and receive additional training, to ensure that they are able to support staff in dealing with safeguarding issues and work effectively with colleagues from different agencies to meet safeguarding priorities. The training received by housing staff includes general safeguarding awareness, as well as more specialist training regarding issues such as domestic abuse and modern-day slavery.
6. The policy has been updated following the statutory revised guidance issued in 2017, following the Care Act of 2014. We have also simplified some sections and removed procedural descriptions from the policy, as these are best covered in the supporting guidance.
7. We have explicitly linked other relevant policies to this one, as they concern areas of housing management practice which frequently involve safeguarding considerations (antisocial behaviour, domestic abuse and hate incidents).

Corporate & Strategic Implications

8. This policy directly supports Corporate Plan outcome number 1: "people are safe and feel safe". It directly addresses our pledge to safeguard children and adults at risk.

Conclusion

9. The Safeguarding Policy for the Housing Division has been refreshed, having been in place since 2016. The policy supports our Corporate safeguarding aims and is itself supported by guidance for officers. The policy has been updated in

light of statutory guidance issued in 2017 and is now linked explicitly to other relevant housing management policies.

Appendices

- Appendix 1: Draft Safeguarding Policy (v.2 – 2021)
- Appendix 2: Consultation feedback

Liam Gillespie

Head of Housing Management
Department of Community and Children's Services

E: liam.gillespie@cityoflondon.gov.uk

T: 020 7332 3785

This page is intentionally left blank



City of London Corporation
Department of Community & Children's Services
Housing Service

Safeguarding Policy

Approved by:	<i>Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee</i>
Original Approval Date:	<i>January 2016</i>
Reviewed:	<i>December 2020</i>
Re-approval Date:	
Review Date	<i>+3 years</i>

1. Purpose and scope

- 1.1 Our Safeguarding policy statement sets out the approach of the City of London Housing Service to the safeguarding of adults and children at risk of harm, abuse or neglect who live in our homes or use our services. It supports and compliment the City Corporations statutory responsibility for safeguarding.
- 1.2 The City Corporation's overall approach is set out in our corporate safeguarding policy and overseen by the City and Hackney Safeguarding Children Partnership and the City and Hackney Safeguarding Adults Board.

2. Policy aims and objectives

- 2.1 The aim of this policy statement is to provide guidance for all our staff to be able to identify potential safeguarding issues, and for us raise concerns and refer cases for further intervention when needed.
- 2.2 By publishing this policy statement, the Housing Service aims to achieve the following key objectives:
 - Raise awareness of safeguarding responsibilities
 - Increase vigilance about safeguarding issues
 - Ensure a prompt and proportionate response when it appears that a child, young person or vulnerable adult is at risk
 - Comply with the objectives of the City and Hackney Safeguarding Children Board and the City and Hackney Safeguarding Adults Board

3. Definitions

- 3.1 The following definitions are used in this policy:

Safeguarding - Safeguarding means protecting children and adults at risk from abuse, neglect, maltreatment, or significant harm

Adult at risk - An adult who:

- a) Has need for care and support (whether or not the authority is meeting any of those needs),
- b) Is experiencing, or is at risk of, abuse and neglect, and
- c) As a result of those needs is unable to protect themselves against abuse or neglect or the risk of it. (Care Act 2014).

Abuse of an adult - Abuse of an adult is a violation of an individual's human and civil rights by any other person(s) who has power over the life of the

dependent individual or an adult in need of support or care who is unable to protect themselves from abuse, self-neglect or neglect because of those needs, regardless of the person's capacity to make decisions

Child or young person - A child or young person is anyone who has not yet reached their 18th birthday. The fact that a child has reached 16 years of age, is living independently or is in further education, is a member of the armed forces, is in hospital or in custody in the secure estate, does not change their status or entitlements to services or protection.

Abuse of a child or young person - Abuse of children is any action that could cause them significant harm

4. Service standards

- 4.1 We aim to provide high quality services to our customers that are effective and culturally sensitive. When we identify concerns regarding the welfare of children and adults at risk we will:

- Maintain strict confidentiality whilst dealing with cases where abuse occurs or is suspected
- Inform victims that some personal information may need to be shared
- Make the safety and wellbeing of the person considered at risk our first priority
- Pass on our concerns swiftly through established referral arrangements
- Involve agencies such as the police where this would be appropriate
- Engage with key partners to facilitate effective responses

5. Legal and regulatory obligations

- 5.1 We have developed this policy using guidance from the Department of Health's Care and Support Statutory Guidance 2017 issued under the Care Act 2014.
- 5.2 There are no direct regulatory obligations linked his policy, however this policy will assist us to comply with the Neighbourhood and Community Standard by supporting vulnerable individuals who may be the victims of anti-social behaviour.

6. **Our approach to safeguarding children and adults at risk**

6.1 **General principles**

The City of London Housing Service recognises that we must do all that we can to protect children and adults at risk from abuse when they engage in services organised or delivered by us.

Our approach to adults at risk and our approach in general is underpinned by the six key principles set out in the Care Act 2014:

- **Empowerment** – presumption of person-led decisions and informed consent.
- **Prevention** – It is better to take action before harm occurs.
- **Proportionality** – Proportionate and least intrusive response appropriate to the risk presented.
- **Protection** – Support and representation for those in greatest need.
- **Partnership** – Local solutions through services working with their communities.
- **Accountability** – Accountability and transparency in delivering safeguarding

6.2 **How the policy will be delivered**

Agreed procedures

We will provide guidance for Housing Services staff to ensure that the signs of abuse can be identified and staff know how to raise concerns or suspicions of abuse and neglect of children, young people and adults at risk. Procedures will include arrangements for working with different agencies.

Supervision and responsible officers

Managers will ensure effective supervision and provide guidance to staff on the operation of this policy. We will nominate a senior manager to lead on safeguarding across the Housing Service to provide guidance and support to employees on safeguarding and vulnerability issues.

Reporting

Where abuse occurs or is suspected our principal concern will be the safety and wellbeing of the person considered at risk. All incidents or suspicions of abuse will be reported to the relevant service manager and be recorded as soon as possible after the event. All staff and contractors have responsibility for raising safeguarding concerns.

We will adopt arrangements to ensure that our concerns are passed to the appropriate agency. Where it is considered appropriate, we will report concerns to the police. Where allegations are made against staff or a contractor's employee, concerns should be reported to the manager responsible for the service area or the head of service.

Training

Staff will receive training to ensure they are aware of their responsibilities and can identify signs of abuse and neglect, recognise harm and make appropriate referrals. A variety of training methods will be employed. We will ensure that all our contractors and external partners understand our approach to safeguarding and their responsibilities when they provide services on our behalf.

Recruitment

We will ensure that recruitment of staff, contractors and volunteers takes account of safeguarding. All appropriate frontline employees will be subject to the relevant Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. Induction arrangements for new staff will include safeguarding.

Sharing information and confidentiality

We will share information securely where it is necessary to do so and is in the best interests of an individual to protect them from harm or abuse. We will normally seek consent before sharing information but if this is not possible or refused, we will share information with other agencies where there is a legal basis for doing so. We will maintain strict confidentiality whilst dealing with cases where abuse occurs or is alleged or suspected.

Working with others

We recognise that safeguarding is achieved through good interagency and multidisciplinary working with other organisations and across local authority boundaries. As a provider of social housing and support services we will build and maintain partnerships and adopt agreed referral procedures to safeguard children and adults at risk.

7. Responsibilities, monitoring and performance

- 7.1 Overall responsibility for this policy and its implementation rests with the Head of Housing Management. The Head of Housing Management will ensure that

staff receive the appropriate training and support to achieve the aims of this policy. We will monitor the number of safeguarding concerns raised and carry out an annual review.

- 7.2 Monitoring of the implementation of this policy and our performance in safeguarding children and adults at risk will be the responsibility of the Housing Management and Almshouses Sub-Committee.

8. **Associated policies**

- Anti-Social Behaviour Policy
- Domestic Abuse Policy
- Hate Incidents Policy

9. **Document management**

Policy title	Safeguarding Policy
Date created	January 2016 (v. 1.0)
Policy owner	Head of Housing Management
Authorised by	Housing Management and Almshouses Sub-Committee
Date authorised	
Review period	3 years
Date of next review	

Consultation and assessment	
Equality Analysis	
Data Protection Impact Assessment	

Document review history			
Version	Date amended	Date approved	Key changes
1.0	N/A	February 2018	Original document
2.0	December 2020		Routine policy review.

This page is intentionally left blank

Safeguarding Policy Review

Appendix Two – Consultation Responses

	Response	Comments
1.	The "safeguarding policy" is a most welcome one, to help to ensure that residents are not being abused either within their home or by a neighbour. I realise that you do house a large number of "vulnerable residents", so this policy is very helpful	
2.	Easy to understand and have no further comments to make	
3.	<p>In times like these, it's reassuring to know that there is help available to people out there who might be in need.</p> <p>It is particularly helpful to know how to proceed if/ when witnessing anyone suffering from neglect/abuse.</p>	

This page is intentionally left blank

Committees: Corporate Projects Board <i>[for information]</i> Projects Sub <i>[for decision]</i> Housing Management & Almshouses Sub <i>[for decision]</i>	Dates: 08 July 2020 15 September 2020 22 March 2021
Subject: Concrete testing & repairs to Golden Lane and Middlesex Street Estates Unique Project Identifier: 11404	Gateway 6: Outcome Report Regular
Report of: Director of Community & Children's Services Report Author: David Downing, Asset Programme Manager	For Decision
PUBLIC	

Summary

1. Status update	<p>Project Description: The reinforced concrete elements of the residential buildings and car parks of the Golden Lane and Middlesex Street Estates had been showing signs of deterioration as seen through areas of cracking and spalling on the external facing surfaces. A project was initiated to first survey and test the structures to identify the causes and extent of this deterioration and then secondly to deliver a programme of repairs based on the recommendations from the condition survey. The programme of concrete repairs is now complete.</p> <p>RAG Status: Green (Green at last report to Committee)</p> <p>Risk Status: Low (Low at last report to Committee)</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision Utilised: £0</p> <p>Final Outturn Cost: £1,129,029</p>
-------------------------	--

2. Next steps and requested decisions	Requested Decisions: <u>Projects Sub Committee and Housing Management & Almshouses Sub Committee</u> 1. To note the content of this report, 2. To note the lessons learnt, 3. To authorise closure of this project.
3. Key conclusions	1. Works were completed within budget but not to the initial timescales envisaged. 2. Following completion of the identified repairs, the external facing concrete elements of the estate in general are now in a satisfactory condition which is consistent with the age and exposure of the buildings. Our independent concrete corrosion specialist has confirmed that the vast majority of the external facing concrete surfaces of the residential blocks do not require further comprehensive testing for a period of 10-15 years, whereas the car parks - where concrete corrosion was more evident – would not require further testing for a period of 5-10 years. 3. The contractor, ENGIE, who delivered both the testing and repair elements of this project, performed poorly at times and their failure to survey the site properly and to adequately manage their appointed hierarchy of subcontractors was at the detriment to the project. The direct appointment of a concrete repair specialist rather than one mediated via a larger contract management company is recommended for future works of this nature. 4. The initial survey design, testing analysis and repair specification was supplied by industry leading specialist Dr John Broomfield. Dr Broomfield's technical guidance throughout the project was invaluable and critical to the ultimately successful outcome.

Main Report

Design & Delivery Review

4. Design into delivery	The project design worked well. The comprehensive condition testing of the concrete post Gateway 2 allowed for a detailed repair specification to be drawn up and applied to a measured bill of
--------------------------------	---

v.April 2019

	<p>quantities for the subsequent repair contract post Gateway 5. The survey design, analysis of testing results and repair specification was supplied by industry leading concrete corrosion specialist Dr John Broomfield. Procuring separate testing and repair contracts did increase programme length but follows industry best practice and enabled proposed repairs to be independently verified. It also allowed for greater control of costs as a single contractor was not identifying their own repairs within a single contract.</p> <p>The project was combined at earlier Gateways with what at face value seemed similar concrete issues at the Barbican Estate. Although brought together to explore potential savings through economies of scale, little benefit was realised from this however as the three sites presented very different design issues which inevitably had to be handled separately from the condition survey tender stage onwards. Combining the design phases did not realise any cost savings and it is highly likely that if each was addressed separately throughout the process the overall programme length would have been shortened as a delay to one site would not necessarily have entailed a delay to the others.</p>
5. Options appraisal	The selected option to procure a contractor to deliver a programme of repairs via open tender successfully delivered the projects objectives. No changes were required during project delivery.
6. Procurement route	<p>Works were procured via open tender advertised on the capital esourcing portal.</p> <p>Procurement Reference: Prj_COL_9349</p>
7. Skills base	The City of London project team had the required skills and experience to manage the delivery of the project. An external concrete corrosion specialist, Dr John Broomfield, was employed to define the testing requirements, analyse testing results, specify the repair methodology for identified repairs and oversee the enaction of those repairs.
8. Stakeholders	Stakeholder engagement was not straightforward for this project, particularly with regard to a number of challenges from Golden Lane Estate leaseholders as to whether the identified repairs should be recoverable via the service charge. There was also concern on Golden Lane Estate regarding the appointment of the contractor ENGIE following the significant increase in both expenditure and programme length of the Great Arthur House recladding project also carried out by this contractor on this Estate.

Variation Review

9. Assessment of project against key milestones	<p>The project progressed as expected throughout the concrete testing phase culminating in the approval of Gateway 4 on 17 February 2017.</p> <p>At Gateway 5 works were forecast to commence April 2018 and conclude October 2018. The delivery phase however took longer than anticipated, with works finishing on site in March 2019. This delay can be attributed in no little part to the poor performance of the main works contractor ENGIE which can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. Their initial pre-contract surveys, on which their tendered price was founded, proved to be inadequate as their proposed access method for the west elevation of Crescent House (a combination of MEWPS, scissor lifts and cherry pickers) was not suitable to enact the repairs from in practice. Rather, full scaffolding of the entire west elevation was required which was time consuming to erect and dismantle. It should be noted that the additional cost of the scaffolding was borne solely by the contractor. It is surprising that this contractor initially failed to adequately design and cost an access method from which to enact the repairs to Crescent House as it was the same contractor who conducted the initial survey that identified the repairs to be completed in the first place.ii. It took several months for the contractor to produce sample repairs for the Listed buildings of the Golden Lane Estate that were acceptable to the City's planning officers.iii. Relationships between ENGIE and their cadre of subcontractors became strained which resulted in numerous poor quality repairs being completed which did not pass quality inspections. The contractor was required to remove and redo the deficient work until it met the satisfaction of the City's project management team. The cost of the additional time required to correct substandard work was again borne solely by the contractor.
10. Assessment of project against Scope	<p>The replacement of concrete balustrades and associated concrete repairs to Cullum Welch House on the Golden Lane Estate was removed from this project (prior to Gateway 4 via Issues Report dated 20/07/16) due to the far higher complexity of this work when compared to the far more prosaic repairs required for the rest of</p>

v. April 2019

	<p>the estate. The works to Cullum Welch House progressed as a stand-alone project and will be subject to a separate Gateway 6 report.</p> <p>Repair works to the Golden Lane podium were also omitted from the project prior to Gateway 4 as the podium area was inaccessible due to the extended time recladding works to Great Arthur House took to complete.</p> <p>Concrete repair works to Great Arthur House were also omitted from this project at delivery stage as the identified remedial works had already been completed as part of the recladding project.</p>
11. Risks and issues	<p>The project proceeded as planned with no significant risks realised during the delivery phase bar the aforementioned issues with the performance of the main contractor and sub-contractors. This is largely attributable to the successful application of lessons learnt from previous projects which were incorporated into the project design and specification which greatly aided the management of the resultant repairs contract.</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision was not applicable to this project.</p>
12. Transition to BAU	<p>The repairs have a defect liability period of 36 months commencing from the date of practical completion. At the close of this period (June 2023), the ongoing maintenance of these repaired sections of concrete will transfer to the general Repairs & Maintenance contract.</p>

Value Review

13. Budget	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i></td><td>Estimated cost (excluding risk): £2,587,500</td></tr> </table> <p>The Gateway 2 projected cost was estimated in 2014 with no provision for cost inflation. The officers managing the project at this time are no longer with the City and the estimating methodology they used is not known. The Gateway 2 estimated also included a £600,000 sum for replacement balustrades for Cullum Welch House and a further £500,000 sum for podium repairs which were both omitted from the project. An adjusted Gateway 2 sum, for comparative purposes, would therefore be £1,487,500.</p>	<i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i>	Estimated cost (excluding risk): £2,587,500
<i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i>	Estimated cost (excluding risk): £2,587,500		

v. April 2019

Golden Lane Estate		
	<i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i>	<i>Final Outturn Cost</i>
<i>Fees</i>	£35,000	£18,123
<i>Staff Costs</i>	£65,000	£48,713
<i>Testing Contract</i>	£282,177	£282,177
<i>Repairs Contract</i>	£674,128	£609,575
<i>Costed Risk Provision</i>	£0	£0
Total	£1,056,305	£958,588

Middlesex Street Estate		
	<i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i>	<i>Final Outturn Cost</i>
<i>Fees</i>	£10,000	£16,957
<i>Staff Costs</i>	£7,000	£7,440
<i>Testing Contract</i>	£31,000	£30,070
<i>Repairs Contract</i>	£112,327	£115,974
<i>Costed Risk Provision</i>	£0	£0
Total	£160,327	£170,441

Project Total		
	<i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i>	<i>Final Outturn Cost</i>
<i>Fees</i>	£45,000	£35,080
<i>Staff Costs</i>	£72,000	£56,153
<i>Testing Contract</i>	£313,177	£312,247
<i>Repairs Contract</i>	£786,455	£725,549
<i>Costed Risk Provision</i>	£0	£0
Total Expenditure	£1,216,632	£1,129,029

A final retention payment is due to be made to the main contractor on expiry of the defects liability period in July 2022. The retention sums are included in the figures presented above.

There is a total underspend on the approved Gateway 5 budget of £87,603. Of this sum, £57,350 is accounted for by the omission from the contract of concrete repair works to Great Arthur House which were not required in this contract as had been undertaken during recladding works. The remainder is unused provision for fees and staff costs.

Final accounts have been subject to an independent verification check, undertaken by a suitably experienced officer within the relevant implementing department.

14. Investment	N/A
15. Assessment of project against SMART objectives	<p>1. The concrete has been tested to the satisfaction of a leading concrete corrosion specialist.</p> <p>2. The condition of the concrete elements of the structures is now known with appropriate future testing requirements identified and programmed into future schedules of work on the Keystone asset management database.</p> <p>3. Repairs to the concrete have been completed to the required specification, maintaining the buildings and extending their useful life whilst meeting heritage requirements for the Golden Lane Estate.</p>
16. Key benefits realised	A comprehensive testing programme has been carried out and all identified repairs have been completed. The concrete elements of the residential buildings and car parks have been confirmed to be in a satisfactory condition for their age and exposure.

Lessons Learned and Recommendations

17. Positive reflections	<p>Works were satisfactorily completed and were delivered within the approved Gateway 5 budget. Where certain elements of the work had to be repeated due to substandard workmanship, this was done at the expense of the contractor.</p> <p>The consultant employed, Dr John Broomfield, is a world leader in the field of concrete corrosion. Dr Broomfield provided specialist advice throughout the project, drafted the repair specification and provided independent oversight of the repairs. The access to industry leading knowledge and experience throughout the project was a critical factor in its successful delivery particularly in terms of responding to leaseholder challenge with expert testimony and verifying the quality of repairs undertaken.</p>
18. Improvement reflections	Procurement – The procurement exercise for this project attracted only two bids which limited the options for the delivery of this project. A subsequent supplier engagement process carried out as part of the Cullum Welch balustrade replacement project (where similar issues were experienced in attracting sufficient suitable bids) revealed that SME concrete repair specialists who would be ideal for this type of

v. April 2019

	<p>work were put off from bidding for local authority contracts due to the perceived tendency of those authorities to appoint predominantly on price typically to the large contract management companies. Pre-tender engagement with suitable specialist contractors is recommended for future projects to ensure that the City's commitment to the most economically advantageous tender rather than necessarily the cheapest is forefront to potential suppliers.</p> <p>Contractor Performance – The repairs contractor had to be called back to redo a significant number of repairs carried out that were not up to the standard required. This had a negative impact on the overall programme. This was in no little part caused by a breakdown in relations between the main works contractor ENGIE and their repairs sub-contractor Gunite, who in turn poorly managed relations with their own subcontractors. The performance of the main contractor ENGIE reflects particularly poorly when compared to that of the specialist SME contractor who recently completed similar works on the Barbican Estate. By contrast, works there were completed to a consistently high standard with the diligence and commitment of the contractor noted. It is interesting to further note that staff costs expended during the delivery of the two projects (with broadly similar final contract values) were 73.7% higher for the Golden Lane/Middlesex Street project than for the Barbican Estate one. This additional amount (totalling £23,827) can be attributed to the increased level of monitoring, verifying and contractor management over and above that required at the Barbican Estate to ensure that completed repairs were to the standards specified. Directly appointing a specialist contractor rather than a large contract management company sitting atop a hierarchy of disengaged subcontractors, should be considered, if at all possible, for future projects of this nature.</p> <p>Project Design – As stated above, little benefit was realised combining the project design phase with the similar works due to take place at the Barbican Estate. The three locations, although all with significant concrete elements in need of repair, presented very different design issues. Combining the design phases did not realise any cost savings (although did ensure a standardised and consistent approach) and it is highly likely that if each were addressed separately throughout the process the overall programme length would have been shortened.</p>
--	--

19. Sharing best practice	<p>1. Dissemination of key information through team and project staff briefings. A standard approach to concrete repairs has been adopted by the Major Works team reflecting industry best practice.</p> <p>2. Lessons learned have been logged and recorded on departmental SharePoint.</p>
20. AOB	N/A

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Coversheet
-------------------	--------------------

Contact

Report Author	David Downing
Email Address	david.downing@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 1645

This page is intentionally left blank

Project Coversheet

[1] Ownership & Status

UPI: 11404

Core Project Name: Concrete testing & repairs to Golden Lane and Middlesex Street Estates

Programme Affiliation (if applicable): N/A

Project Manager: David Downing

Definition of need: The reinforced concrete elements of the Golden Lane and Middlesex Street Estates are showing signs of deterioration. A condition survey is required to identify the extent and causes of this deterioration, and to inform a programme of remedial repairs to restore the concrete and prolong the life of the buildings.

Key measures of success: 1. The concrete has been tested to reveal the cause and extent of the deterioration.

2. The testing information informs a programme of repairs to be completed.

3. Repairs to the structure are complete.

4. Timelines for future testing are identified.

Expected timeframe for the project delivery: Project Complete

Key Milestones:

Are we on track for completing the project against the expected timeframe for project delivery? Yes

Has this project generated public or media impact and response which the City of London has needed to manage or is managing?

No

[2] Finance and Costed Risk

Headline Financial, Scope and Design Changes:

'Project Briefing' G1 report (as approved by Chief Officer 04/14):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £2,587,500
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- Estimated Programme Dates: Condition survey to start Summer 2014

Scope/Design Change and Impact: N/A

'Project Proposal' G2 report (as approved by PSC 05/14):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £2,587,500
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £11,150
- Spend to date: £0
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- CRP Requested: N/A
- CRP Drawn Down: N/A

Estimated Programme Dates: Condition survey to start Summer 2014

Scope/Design Change and Impact: None

‘Options Appraisal and Design’ G3 report (as approved by PSC 22/07/14):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £2,587,000
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £1,009,150
- Spend to date: £9,850
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- CRP Requested: N/A
- CRP Drawn Down: N/A
- Estimated Programme Dates: Concrete testing to complete February 2015

Scope/Design Change and Impact: None

‘Options Appraisal and Design’ G4 report (as approved by PSC 17/02/17):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £1,370,000
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £18,400
- Spend to date: £324,812
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- CRP Requested: N/A
- CRP Drawn Down: N/A
- Estimated Programme Dates: Concrete repairs programme to commence September 2017

Scope/Design Change and Impact: Barbican Estate works had been combined with this project between Gateways 3 and 4 (in a Gateway 2 for Barbican Estate Concrete repairs dated 08/10/2014) , but it was determined at Gateway 4 that these should be tendered separately and to proceed separately through the Gateway process to conclusion. Replacement of the pre-cast concrete balustrades at Cullum Welch House was also removed from this project to proceed separately through the gateway process via Issues Report dated 20/07/2016.

‘Authority to start Work’ G5 report (as approved by Chief Officer 15/01/18):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £1,216,631
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £891,819
- Spend to date: £324,812
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- CRP Requested: N/A
- CRP Drawn Down: N/A
- Estimated Programme Dates: April 2018 – October 2018

Scope/Design Change and Impact: None

Total anticipated on-going commitment post-delivery [£]: N/A
Programme Affiliation [£]: N/A

Committees: Corporate Projects Board <i>[for information]</i> Projects Sub <i>[for decision]</i> Housing Management & Almshouses Sub <i>[for decision]</i>	Dates: 10 March 2021 24 March 2021 22 March 2021
Subject: Decent Homes works to properties previously omitted from programmes (Call-backs 2017-2020) Unique Project Identifier: 11790	Gateway 6: Outcome Report Regular
Report of: Director of Community & Children's Services Report Author: David Downing, Asset Programme Manager	For Decision
PUBLIC	

Summary

1. Status update	<p>Project Description: This project provided a capped budget of £500,000 to facilitate ad hoc kitchen, bathroom and WC upgrades over a three year period to tenanted properties on City of London housing estates previously omitted from large scale Decent Homes programmes. These properties would have been omitted as they may have met the standard at the time or the works may have been refused by the tenant in occupation. Over time, as previously acceptable components failed or when properties where works were refused fell vacant, the call-backs contract allowed the City to bring the components up to the required standard within the certainty of a tendered specification at a fixed schedule of rates. Abbott Property Solutions Ltd were awarded the contract and successfully completed upgrades within 49 properties which were identified as qualifying for works within the contract period.</p> <p>RAG Status: Green (Green at last report to Committee)</p> <p>Risk Status: Low (Low at last report to Committee)</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision Utilised: £0</p>
-------------------------	---

v.April 2019

	Funding Source: Housing Revenue Account Final Outturn Cost: £511,250
2. Next steps and requested decisions	Requested Decisions: <u>Projects Sub Committee and Housing Management & Almshouses Sub Committee</u> 1. To note the content of this report, 2. To note the lessons learnt, 3. To authorise closure of this project.
3. Key conclusions	1. The Call-backs contract remains a vital resource in ensuring the timely upgrading of key components to previously hard to access properties as they fall void between other large scale Decent Homes programmes. 2. Works to 49 properties were completed and brought up to modern Decent Homes standards within the three year contract period. During project planning, the budget cap was estimated to be sufficient to complete works to 50 properties. A sum of £3,409 of the allocated works budget remained unspent.

Main Report

Design & Delivery Review

4. Design into delivery	The project design, repeating that of the previously successful Decent Homes projects again worked well. Tightly defined 'all-inclusive' specifications were drawn up setting a maximum upper price limit on all components that could be scaled down on instruction but not exceeded. This was a large factor in the successful delivery of the project and a significant aid to overall cost control and is a recommended approach for future projects of this nature.
5. Options appraisal	The selected option to procure a contractor to deliver the works as required on an ad hoc basis via open tender successfully delivered the projects objectives. This was repeated from the preceding 2014-2017 Call-backs project where project objectives were successfully delivered. No changes were required during project delivery.

6. Procurement route	<p>The works contract was successfully procured via open tender. The tender generated an appropriate and manageable number of competitively priced bids for evaluation. This procurement route can be recommended for future projects of this nature.</p> <p>Procurement Reference: itt_COL_6671 - Decent Homes CallBacks</p>
7. Skills base	<p>The City of London project team had the required skills and experience to deliver the project. All aspects of project management for this project were handled internally.</p>
8. Stakeholders	<p>As the majority of works under this contract were carried out to properties as they fell void between tenancies, the extent of external stakeholder engagement required to successfully develop and deliver this project was minimal.</p>

Variation Review

9. Assessment of project against key milestones	<p>The project progressed as expected throughout the design period with a main works contractor appointed in October 2017 as anticipated at Gateway 5.</p> <p>During the delivery phase, the fixed term contract ran as expected for the three year duration without variation.</p>
10. Assessment of project against Scope	<p>The scope of the project remained unchanged throughout both the design period and project delivery.</p> <p>Works were successfully completed to 49 properties. At previous Gateways, the budget estimates allowed for completion of work to 50 properties.</p>
11. Risks and issues	<p>This project is a repeat of a previously successful Decent Homes Call-backs contract which was procured and delivered in the same way. As such, the project proceeded as planned with no significant risks realised. This is largely attributable to the successful application of lessons learnt from previous Decent Homes projects which were incorporated into the project design, specification and procurement which greatly aided the management of the resultant contract.</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision was not applicable to this project.</p>

v. April 2019

12. Transition to BAU	The new installations have a defect liability period of 12 months commencing from the date of practical completion. At the close of this period, the ongoing maintenance of these new installations will transfer to the general Repairs & Maintenance contract.
------------------------------	--

Value Review

13. Budget	<table><tr><td><i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i></td><td>Estimated cost (excluding risk): Range £500,000</td></tr></table>		<i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i>	Estimated cost (excluding risk): Range £500,000																
	<i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i>	Estimated cost (excluding risk): Range £500,000																		
	The Gateway 2 cost range was a product of analogous estimating with comparative cost data drawn from previous Decent Homes Call-backs projects.																			
	<table><tr><td></td><td><i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i></td><td><i>Final Outturn Cost</i></td></tr><tr><td><i>Fees</i></td><td>£15,000</td><td>£0</td></tr><tr><td><i>Staff Costs</i></td><td>£60,000</td><td>£14,659</td></tr><tr><td><i>Works Contract</i></td><td>£500,000</td><td>£496,591</td></tr><tr><td><i>Costed Risk Provision</i></td><td>£0</td><td>£0</td></tr><tr><td><i>Project Total</i></td><td>£575,000</td><td>£511,250</td></tr></table>			<i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i>	<i>Final Outturn Cost</i>	<i>Fees</i>	£15,000	£0	<i>Staff Costs</i>	£60,000	£14,659	<i>Works Contract</i>	£500,000	£496,591	<i>Costed Risk Provision</i>	£0	£0	<i>Project Total</i>	£575,000	£511,250
		<i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i>	<i>Final Outturn Cost</i>																	
<i>Fees</i>	£15,000	£0																		
<i>Staff Costs</i>	£60,000	£14,659																		
<i>Works Contract</i>	£500,000	£496,591																		
<i>Costed Risk Provision</i>	£0	£0																		
<i>Project Total</i>	£575,000	£511,250																		
There is a total underspend on the approved Gateway 5 budget of £63,750. Almost the entirety of the underspend is unused provision for professional fees and staff costs. The main works contractor, Abbotts Property Solutions Ltd, performed well throughout and did not require the same degree of continual monitoring and oversight to ensure cost and quality control as less diligent contractors may have necessitated. All project management roles were filled by internal departmental resource, the small provision allowed for external fees was therefore not required.																				
Final accounts have been subject to an independent verification check, undertaken by a suitably experienced officer within the relevant implementing department.																				
14. Investment	N/A																			

v. April 2019

15. Assessment of project against SMART objectives	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This project brought 49 homes up to required standards and ensured compliance with statutory obligations. During planning stages, it was estimated that the allotted budget would fund works for a maximum of 50 properties. 2. The programme of works was delivered to the desired specification and within the agreed costs with minimal variation. Value for money has been demonstrated by the cost savings apparent when compared to previous Decent Homes projects.
16. Key benefits realised	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improved and modernised facilities for 49 properties where works were completed. 2. The value of the City's Housing assets was maintained. 3. Compliance with statutory measures. 4. Newly installed kitchens have expected lifespans of 20 years. 5. Newly installed bathrooms have expected lifespans of 30 years.

Lessons Learned and Recommendations

17. Positive reflections	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Call-backs contract remains a vital resource in ensuring the timely upgrading of key components to previously hard to access properties as they fall void between other large scale Decent Homes programmes. 2. The fixed term schedule of rates contract allowed accurate financial monitoring and a high degree of cost certainty. 3. The flexibility of the contract allowed works to proceed as required at fixed rates over a pre-defined period of time rather than subject to multiple procurements. 4. The contractor, Abbott Property Solutions Ltd, performed well over the period of the contract and can be recommended for future works of this nature.
18. Improvement reflections	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Future call-backs projects should consider a small increase to the overall budget cap of £500,000 to ensure resourcing

	<p>remains sufficient to cover the required works over future periods.</p> <p>2. As a recurring term contract, some consideration could perhaps be given at Corporate level as to whether such repeat pieces of work should be treated as Business as Usual and not required to go through the project development cycle as each term contract nears expiry. In project management terms a repeat piece of work cannot by definition be a project.</p>
19. Sharing best practice	<p>1. Dissemination of key information through team and project staff briefings. A standard approach to Decent Homes work has been adopted by the Property Services team reflecting industry best practice.</p> <p>2. Lessons learned have been logged and recorded on departmental SharePoint.</p>
20. AOB	N/A

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Coversheet
-------------------	--------------------

Contact

Report Author	David Downing
Email Address	david.downing@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 1645

Project Coversheet

[1] Ownership & Status

UPI: 11790

Core Project Name: Decent Homes works to properties previously omitted from programmes (Call-backs 2017-2020)

Programme Affiliation (if applicable): None

Project Manager: David Downing

Definition of need: Replacement of qualifying kitchens, bathrooms and heating equipment in City-owned tenanted housing stock to meet statutory requirements in properties previously omitted from other Decent Homes programmes on an ad hoc basis as properties become Void or on request from residents.

Key measures of success:

1. Completion of all required works to meet statutory and City standards.
2. Achievement of expected lifespan of 20-25 years for new installations.

Expected timeframe for the project delivery: September 2017 – March 2020

Key Milestones: Project Complete

Are we on track for completing the project against the expected timeframe for project delivery? Yes

Has this project generated public or media impact and response which the City of London has needed to manage or is managing? No

[2] Finance and Costed Risk

Headline Financial, Scope and Design Changes:

‘Project Briefing’ G1 report (as approved by Chief Officer 10/01/2017):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £500,000
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- Estimated Programme Dates: August 2017 – March 2020

Scope/Design Change and Impact:

‘Project Proposal’ G2 report (as approved by PSC 31/01/2017):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £500,000
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £1,000
- Spend to date: £0
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- CRP Requested: N/A
- CRP Drawn Down: N/A
- Estimated Programme Dates: August 2017 – March 2020

Scope/Design Change and Impact: None

‘Options Appraisal and Design’ G3-4 report (as approved by PSC 10/05/2017):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £575,000
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £5,000
- Spend to date: £1,000
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- CRP Requested: N/A
- CRP Drawn Down: N/A

- Estimated Programme Dates: September 2017 – March 2020

Scope/Design Change and Impact: Budget increase of £75,000 approved to include allowance for fees and internal staff costs.

‘Authority to start Work’ G5 report (as approved by Chief Officer 18/09/2017):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £575,000
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £569,000
- Spend to date: £3,000
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- CRP Requested: N/A
- CRP Drawn Down: N/A
- Estimated Programme Dates: October 2017 – March 2020

Scope/Design Change and Impact: None

Total anticipated on-going commitment post-delivery [£]: £0

Programme Affiliation [£]: N/A

Committee	Dated:
Housing Management & Almshouses Sub Committee	22 March 2021
Subject: Housing Major Works Programme – Progress Report	Public
Report of: Director of Community & Children’s Services	For Information
Report author: Paul Murtagh Assistant Director Barbican & Property Services	

Summary

The purpose of this report is to update Members on the progress that has been made with the Housing Major Works Programme and to advise Members on issues affecting progress on individual schemes.

Recommendation

Members are asked to note the report.

Main Report

Background

1. At its meeting on 27 November 2017, the Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee received a presentation from officers in Housing Property Services on the scope of, and progress with, the Housing Major Works Programme. Members subsequently agreed that it would be useful if further updates and progress reports be brought to future meetings of this Sub-Committee.
2. The first update and progress report was presented to this Sub-Committee at its meeting on 12 February 2018. This seventeenth update report highlights specific areas of ‘slippage’ or ‘acceleration’ since the last meeting of the Sub-Committee on 30 November 2020 as well as, progress against the programme as originally reported in November 2017.

Considerations

3. The City of London Corporation (City Corporation) is committed to investing around £75million on a Major Works Programme for the maintenance, refurbishment and improvement of its social housing portfolio. The works, in the main comprise:
 - Window replacements;
 - Re-roofing;

- Decent Homes (new kitchens and bathrooms);
 - Electrical rewiring and upgrades;
 - Heating replacements;
 - Concrete repairs.
4. The funding for these extensive works, which are intended to bring all the City Corporation's social housing stock up to, and beyond, the Decent Homes Standard, comes from the Housing Revenue Account (HRA), which is ring-fenced solely for housing. The HRA is made up of:
- Income from rents;
 - Income from service charges.
5. The Housing Major Works Programme was originally intended to be a 5-year programme however, the size and complexity of some of the projects included, along with initial staff resourcing issues, has meant that it is more likely to take 7 or 8 years to complete.
6. The Housing Major Works Programme is monitored and managed at several levels both corporately and within the department. This includes:
- Gateway Process;
 - DCCS Committee;
 - Projects Sub-Committee;
 - Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee;
 - Housing Programme Board.
7. The Housing Programme Board (HPB) is a cross-departmental group, chaired by the Director of Community & Children's Services and comprising senior officers from:
- Housing Management;
 - Housing Property Services;
 - City Surveyors;
 - Planning;
 - Finance;
 - Town Clerks;
 - City Procurement.
8. For the purpose of the HPB, officers have developed detailed report templates that show progress of the various works programmes and these are analysed and discussed monthly. At its meeting on 27 November 2017, following a presentation from officers in Housing Property Services on the scope of, and progress with the Housing Major Works Programme, Members agreed that a simplified version of the progress reports be brought to future meetings of this Sub-Committee.
9. Attached at Appendix 1 to this report, for Members consideration, is the latest version of the progress report for the Housing Major Works Improvement

Programme. This progress report was submitted to, and considered by the HPB at its meeting on 25 February 2021.

10. Members will note from the progress report at Appendix 1 that there are currently six projects that have 'slipped' since the last meeting of this Sub-Committee, five of which, are directly attributable to the current COVID-19 restrictions. Given that we continue to operate in difficult and challenging times as a result of the outbreak of COVID-19, Members will understand the impact this has had on the programme. Members are asked to specifically note the following updates:

Extension of projects in delivery

H42 – Petticoat Tower Front Door Replacement

Members have been previously advised that Gerda Security Holdings has been appointed to carry out the replacement of the front entrance doors in Petticoat Tower. Although, we have completed 50% of the new door installations, this project was again put 'on hold' as a result of further Government restrictions due to COVID-19. Notifiable and licensed asbestos removal works are required to facilitate the front door replacements and, this will require residents to vacate their homes for one day whilst this work is carried out. The current lockdown restrictions have resulted in a further estimated two-month delay on this project.

H43 – Decent Homes (Harman Close)

The internal works to bring the homes in this sheltered housing scheme up to the Decent Homes Standard remain 'on hold' as a result of Government restrictions due to COVID-19. There are only approximately four weeks of work left to do on this project and, as soon as restrictions allow, we will be looking to complete this work as quickly as possible. The current lockdown restrictions have resulted in a further estimated two-month delay on this project.

H44 – Refurbishment Works - City of London & Gresham Almshouses

Members will recall from its previous meeting that external works re-started towards the end of September last year, having previously been put on hold due to the current health crisis and the number of vulnerable residents in our homes. The internal works have suffered significantly as a result of COVID-19 and, we currently estimate that the project is delayed by nine months.

H45 – York Way Estate Communal Heating

Works to replace the distribution pipework are complete and work in the plant room is ongoing. Unfortunately, however, in-flat installations are on hold until the current restrictions are eased, and it is deemed safe for work to recommence inside our resident's homes. There is currently an estimated delay of three months on this project.

H52 – Avondale Communal and Emergency Lighting

An extension of time has been granted for a further four weeks to allow for the completion of additional works at George Elliston House and Eric Wilkins House.

Progress of note on key projects

H17 – Golden Lane Heating Replacement Phase 2 (Crescent House and Cullum Welch House)

Officers are currently reviewing internal and external surveys and assessing feasibility studies. We are currently formalising an agreed process with the City Corporation's Planning Officers and will be undertaking a formal consultation on the shortlisted options once the process is agreed with Planning. We have also been working with colleagues from the Housing Team on the metering and billing requirements as the changing legislation will determine the scope and brief of the infrastructure project as we proceed to detailed design.

H39 – Window Replacements and External Redecorations (Multiple Estates)

A Gateway 5 report for the window replacement programme at Dron House was approved in December last year. We are currently in the process of exchanging contracts and, have agreed provisional site possession with the contractor for May 2021. For the remaining estates (William Blake, Windsor House, Holloway, Pakeman House, Stopher House, Sumner Buildings and Sydenham Hill) all tenders have been received and, all technical evaluations have been completed. Officers in City Procurement are currently evaluating the pricing submissions and, the financial checks and clarifications are underway. This is taking slightly longer than anticipated as some of the pricing submissions have not been fully completed by some of the tenderers.

H41 – Front Entrance Door Replacement Great Arthur House

We have experienced some delays due to lockdown and access restrictions but, we have still managed to undertake external and internal surveys in between lockdowns. The Design Team and Fire Safety Consultant have drawn up a Draft Fire Safety Strategy. The Design Team has developed several options for the compartmentation requirements and, we are currently at the stage where we can commence the design brief. It should be noted however, that this is very much dependent upon the scope and progress of the works being undertaken as part of the sprinkler installation project and, we continue to liaise very closely across the two projects.

We have been liaising with City Corporation Planning Officers and are awaiting confirmation of an initial meeting prior to commencement of the formal Pre-Planning Meetings. We have also been engaging extensively with the City Corporation's Building Control Team and Fire Safety Officer in developing the design requirements.

H46 – Middlesex Street Estate Communal Heating

Work has now started on the installation of the distribution pipework around the estate. This will take until late spring/early summer to complete, before the in-flat surveys and subsequent installations can begin.

H54 – Fire Door Replacement Programme (Multiple Estates)

A measured survey of the works for Phase 1 of this programme (York Way and Holloway Estates) is currently underway with the contractors pricing submission now expected in early April.

11. As Members will appreciate, there will always be problems with contracts and projects such as those contained within the Housing Major Works Programme. In addition, we are currently operating in what are, for most of us, unprecedented times. The COVID-19 situation continues to have a significant impact on service delivery and, the Major Works Programme is particularly adversely affected. That said, we continue to meet with our contractors and consultants on a regular basis to see what can be done to get these projects back up and running.
12. Members will also recognise that progress with any of the projects included in the Housing Major Works Programme can change at short notice. It is often the case that notable changes in projects will have occurred from the time that reports are written to the time that they are presented to this Sub-Committee. Where appropriate, Officers will provide further updates to Members when presenting this report.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Housing Major Works Programme Progress Report (March 2021)

Paul Murtagh
Assistant Director, Barbican & Property Services
T: 020 7332 3015 E: paul.murtagh@cityoflondon.gov.uk






This page is intentionally left blank

[illegible][illegible]

Page 69

WORKS TYPE	REF	PROJECT	ESTIMATED COST	EXPENDITURE TO DATE	CURRENT STATUS	SLIPPAGE SINCE LAST REPORT	TIMELINE																																																															
							2018/19																2019/20																2020/21																2021/22															
							Q1				Q2				Q3				Q4				Q1				Q2				Q3				Q4				Q1				Q2				Q3				Q4																			
A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M																							
INVESTMENT PROGRAMME	H6	Decent Homes Avondale - Phase II	£461,305	£392,780	works complete																																																																	
	H20	Redecorations (multiple estate programme)	£607,150	£571,252	works complete																																																																	
	H43	Decent Homes Harman Close	£980,000	£814,285	on hold - due to covid	+ 2 months																																																																
	H1	Avondale Square - Window Overhaul	£453,440	£417,000	works complete																																																																	
	H26	Water Tank Replacement/Repairs (multiple estate programme)	£92,104	£36,000	works complete																																																																	
	H48	Electrical Testing - Phase III (tenanted flats multiple estates)	£555,266	£467,000	works complete																																																																	
	H47	Electrical Testing - Phase IV (landlords electrics multiple estates)	£355,567	£229,500	works complete																																																																	
	H54	Fire Door Replacement Programme (multiple estate programme)	£2,790,000	£4,800	procurement																																																																	
	H55	Installation of Sprinklers (Point Blocks as part of a multiple estate programme)	£4,000,000	£114,000	contract start delayed due to covid	+ 6 months																																																																
	H52	Avondale Communal & Emergency Lighting	£337,000	£265,285	complete	+1 month																																																																
	H53	Play and Ball Games Area Refurbishment (multiple estate programme)	£272,000	£19,130	procurement																																																																	
	H60	Electrical Testing - Phase V (tenants electrical testing & smoke alarms - multiple estates)	£420,000	£0	on site																																																																	
H59	George Elliston & Eric Wilkins Refurbishment	£3,700,000	£0	initiation																																																																		

[illegible][illegible]

-  works delivery baseline (as forecast November 2017)
- works on site/complete
-  works programmed (current forecast)
-  testing/preparatory/offsite works
-  programme slippage from previous report (length of arrow denotes length of delay)
-  programme brought forward from previous report (length of arrow denotes extent)

WORKS TYPE	REF	PROJECT	ESTIMATED COST	EXPENDITURE TO DATE	CURRENT STATUS	SLIPPAGE SINCE LAST REPORT	TIMELINE																																								
							2018/19												2019/20												2020/21								2021/22								
							Q1			Q2			Q3			Q4			Q1			Q2			Q3			Q4			Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4										
A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M
INVESTMENT PROGRAMME	H5	Decent Homes - Phase II (multiple estate programme)	£608,000	£574,297	works complete																																										
	H20	Redecorations (multiple estate programme)	£596,000	£541,000	works complete																																										
	H26	Water Tank Replacement/Repairs (multiple estate programme)	£130,653	£49,000	works complete																																										
	H48	Electrical Testing - Phase III (tenanted flats multiple estates)	£555,266	£467,000	works complete																																										
	H47	Electrical Testing - Phase IV (landlords electrics multiple estates)	£355,567	£229,500	works complete																																										
	H45	Communal Heating	£3,087,990	£1,355,300	programme extended - covid	+3 months																																									
	H60	Electrical Testing - Phase V (tenants electrical testing & smoke alarms - multiple estates)	£420,000	£0	on site																																										
	H54	Fire Door Replacement Programme (Lot 1 - Holloway & York Way)	£1,112,500	£4,800	procurement																																										

WORKS TYPE	REF		ESTIMATED COST	EXPENDITURE TO DATE	CURRENT STATUS	SLIPPAGE SINCE LAST REPORT	TIMELINE																																															
							2018/19												2019/20												2020/21												2021/22											
							Q1			Q2			Q3			Q4			Q1			Q2			Q3			Q4			Q1			Q2			Q3			Q4														
A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M							
INVESTMENT PROGRAMME	H5	Decent Homes - Phase II (multiple estate programme)	£173,315	£46,472	works complete																																																	
	H48	Electrical Testing - Phase III (tenanted flats multiple estates)	£555,266	£467,000	works complete																																																	
	H47	Electrical Testing - Phase IV (landlords electrics multiple estates)	£355,567	£229,500	works complete																																																	
	H39	Window Replacements & Extenal Redecoration (Sydenham Hill)	£466,500	£23,000	procurement																																																	
	H60	Electrical Testing - Phase V (tenants electrical testing & smoke alarms - multiple estates)	£420,000	£0	on site																																																	
	H54	Fire Door Replacement Programme (multiple estate programme)	£192,500	£4,800	procurement																																																	

WORKS TYPE	REF	PROJECT	ESTIMATED COST	EXPENDITURE TO DATE	CURRENT STATUS	SLIPPAGE SINCE LAST REPORT	TIMELINE																																							
							2018/19												2019/20												2020/21								2021/22							
							Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4									
A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M											
INVESTMENT PROGRAMME	H5	Decent Homes - Phase II (Dron & Windsor as part of multiple estate programme)		£686,216	£451,412	works complete																																								
	H26	Water Tank Replacement/Repairs (multiple estate programme)		£15,810	£15,810	works complete																																								
	H48	Electrical Testing - Phase III (tenanted flats multiple estates)		£555,266	£372,000	works complete																																								
	H10	Door Entry (Dron House in conjunction with William Blake)		£120,000	£120,000	works complete																																								
	H56	Re-Roofing at Dron House		£404,000	£363,000	works complete																																								
	H47	Electrical Testing - Phase IV (landlords electrics multiple estates)		£355,567	£229,500	works complete																																								
	H39	Window Replacements & External Redecoration (Dron)		£1,600,000	£25,000	contractor appointment																																								
	H39	Window Replacements & External Redecoration (Windsor)		£890,000	£21,000	procurement																																								
	H60	Electrical Testing - Phase V (tenants electrical testing & smoke alarms - multiple estates)		£420,000	£0	on site																																								
	H54	Fire Door Replacement Programme (multiple estate programme)		£890,000	£4,800	procurement																																								
	H53	Play and Ball Games Area Refurbishment (multiple estate programme)		£272,000	£19,130	procurement																																								
	H44	COLA & Gresham Refurbishment		£838,669	£154,750	on site, internal works on hold	+ 9 months																																							

7

- works delivery baseline (as forecast November 2017)
- works on site/complete
- works programmed (current forecast)
- testing/preparatory/offsite works
- programme slippage from previous report (length of arrow denotes length of delay)
- programme brought forward from previous report (length of arrow denotes extent)

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank